## I strongly OPPOSE HB 6816!

California created a law similar to this one and is currently being reheard in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit. When SCOTUS released the Bruen Decision, SCOTUS granted a petition for certiorari, vacated, and remanded it back to the 9th.

In New Jersey TRO, Judge Bumb's Opinion: "All agree that violent crimes involving firearms are tragic. But the dictate of Bruen is clear: "legislative interest balancing is understandable – and, everywhere, appropriate –[but] it is not deference that the Constitution demands here." While the legislature may disagree with Bruen, it may not disobey it"

Bruen was clear! In keeping with Heller, we hold that when the Second Amendment's plain text covers an individual's conduct, the Constitution presumptively protects that conduct. To justify its regulation, the government may not simply posit that the regulation promotes an important interest. *Rather, the government must demonstrate that the regulation is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation.* Only if a firearm regulation is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition may a court conclude that the individual's conduct falls outside the Second Amendment's "unqualified command." That history is during the time of the Founding Fathers. Bruen went father state around 1791, not the 20° or 21° century.

Microstamping is not a proven technology and after a few 1,000 rounds start to fail firing the cartridge, which then places some using a gun for self-defense a failure and potential loss of life. The primers in a cartridge are hardened which when the firing pin hits the primer, wears the firing pin down. This is putting lives at risk, which could also create a jamb of the bullet stuck in the barrel and the next round could blow up the gun. This bill states that if the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection, completes and investigation on the viability of this technology, the commissioner may decline to certify such technology. This is just a ploy to end gun rights and limited the number of guns that meet this requirement.

This bill rises the age from 18 to 21. In the 1792 Militia Act, all males ages 18 to 45 were required to have arms, power, and ball at the ready. In today's standards, that is about 500 rounds. The 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit FPC v Texas ruled that 2<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights are granted to 18 to 20-year-olds. The 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit En banc panel ruled 13 to 3 stating that the Founding Fathers were clear during the 1792 Militia Act, 18 to 45 years old had the right to Bear Arms. Heller, reaffirmed by Bruen, defined that "Bear" is to own, purchase, or make arms. Arms were defined as "arms" as "anything that a man wears for his defense, or takes into his hands, or useth in wrath to cast at or strike another." HB 6816 is also violating the right to "bear arms" as defined by SCOTUS. Body armor is used for defense which is covered under the 2<sup>th</sup> Amendment, as "anything that a man wears for his defense..".

The majority party of the legislative branch is not following their oath and always creates Malum Prohitum laws: wrong due to being prohibited, which refers to crimes made so by statute. If this bill is passed, it will be overturned by Bruen's dictate.

James Ritchie, CISA, CISSP, NRA Certified Instructor, CCDL Outreach NW Regional Manager